1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
3	* * * * * * * * * * * * * 19CR10117-IT-10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA* *
5	VS. * SEPTEMBER 26, 2019 * 11:00 A.M. STEPHEN SEMPREVIVO *
6	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * BOSTON, MA
7	BEFORE THE HONORABLE INDIRA TALWANI
8	DISTRICT JUDGE
10	(Sentencing)
11	APPEARANCES:
12	FOR THE GOVERNMENT: KRISTEN A. KEARNEY, AUSA ERIC S. ROSEN, AUSA
13 14	U.S. Attorney's Office 1 Courthouse Way Suite 9200 Boston, MA 02210
15 16	FOR THE DEFENDANT: DAVID E. KENNER, ESQ. Kenner and Greenfield 16633 Ventura Blvd. Encino, CA 91436
17 18	ALVIN E. ENTIN, ESQ.
19	Entin Law Group, P.A. 633 South Andrews Avenue Suite 500 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
20	
21	STEVEN C. BOOZANG, ESQ. Steven C. Boozang, Esq. 439 Washington Street
22	Dedham, MA 02026
23 24	Court Reporter: Debra D. Lajoie, RPR-FCRR-CRI-RMR 1 Courthouse Way Boston, MA 02210
25	Proceeding reported and produced by computer-aided stenography

26 SEPTEMBER 2019 -- 11:00 A.M.

THE CLERK: United States District Court is now in session, the Honorable Judge Indira Talwani presiding. This is Case No. 19CR10117, the United States v. Stephen Semprevivo.

Will counsel please identify themselves for record.

MS. KEARNEY: Good morning, Your Honor.

Kristen Kearney and Eric Rosen for the Government.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. KENNER: Good morning, Your Honor.

David Kenner, Alvin Entin and Steve Boozang for

Mr. Semprevivo.

THE COURT: Good morning.

We are here for sentencing, and I will go through first the documents that I have received and reviewed. I have the presentence report. It was prepared on August 7th and revised on September 4th. I do not have a sentencing recommendation from the Probation Office per the Government's objection.

I have the Government's memorandum regarding methodology for calculating gain or loss under the guidelines, that was Docket 420 and amended at 422; Probation's submission in response to my order that was for 40, and all of that was addressed in my memorandum

and order. That's Docket 443.

I have reviewed the Government's sentencing memorandum as to all Defendants, that's 423, was filed September 6; and an additional sentencing memorandum as to Mr. Semprevivo, that's Document 466 filed September 19; Defendant's sentencing memorandum, as filed at Docket 469. I believe it was first filed at 467. I haven't reviewed the difference between the two documents, if any. So I have reviewed 469 after I granted leave for excess pages and Exhibits 1 through 16, including the sealed unredacted Exhibits as 1A, 1B and 2B. And I have a victim-impact statement from Georgetown that was dated August 2nd.

To my knowledge, there is no other material that has been submitted by the parties to the Court; is that correct?

MR. KENNER: Yes. Your Honor.

MS. KEARNEY: Your Honor, after the submission of the Government's sentencing memo, we did receive a breakdown of the restitution requests from Georgetown, which we did properly provide to Probation and to defense counsel.

THE COURT: Okay. I haven't received that.

MS. KEARNEY: May I provide it now?

THE COURT: I'll look at it.

And this was submitted to you on September 18; is that correct?

MS. KEARNEY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So just so that the Government, since you're a repeat player here, if you could understand what information I do and don't receive from Probation, it might help in sentencings.

When the Probation Officer provides the initial presentence report to the parties, I don't get a copy at that time. When you file your objections, I don't get the copy of those written objections. What I get is what you see, that final presentence report that gets to you, that's what I see.

I can thereafter make requests to the Probation Officer for anything else, but I don't -- simply because you hand something to the Probation Officer doesn't satisfy getting in front of me, and part of that is because there's a procedure for what I have and what documents I have and what are part of the record. And when the Government or a party thinks that I have all of this other material that isn't part of a Court record, it sort of misunderstands the process.

So I did not see this. Your giving it to

Probation means it was available for me to request from

Probation, but I don't think I even knew that you gave

it to Probation. You did mention that you had received 1 2 it on the 18th. But, at any rate, if you're looking to 3 file something for my attention in advance of a sentencing, the way to do it is a motion for leave to 4 5 file something. MS. KEARNEY: Yes, Your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: Thank you. 8 MR. KENNER: Your Honor? 9

THE COURT: Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have previously handed your Clerk MR. KENNER: a couple of documents. One is a document from Volunteers of America/Upward Bound. This is a more readable copy of Attachment 2 to Exhibit 16, which is the information and material from Volunteers of When reviewing it, I found it a little America. difficult to read, so I provided you with a clearer copy.

THE COURT: Okay. I was just handed three pieces of paper, so tell me what the three pieces of paper -- one is --

> MR. KENNER: There's --

THE COURT: Hold on a minute. One is a clearer copy of Attachment --

MR. KENNER: 2, which follows the letter from Bob Pratt in Exhibit 15 -- I'm sorry -- Exhibit 16. Ι

1 apologize. 2 THE COURT: Exhibit 16 is 467 --3 MR. KENNER: The materials from Volunteers of America, Your Honor. 4 5 THE COURT: Okay. And --And you will notice there is an MR. KENNER: 6 7 Attachment 2. 8 THE COURT: Yes. So it's a 32-page document. 9 I'm just trying to figure out which page you're 10 replacing of the 32 pages. 11 MR. KENNER: It would be the fifth page, Your Honor. At the top it reads, "Attachment 2" and 12 13 "Upward Bound." 14 THE COURT: Yes, it is far more legible than 15 that one, and the Clerk will replace -- it's Document 16 467-17, Page 8 of 32, and if you could replace it with 17 this page, that would be great. 18 MR. KENNER: Thank you. 19 THE COURT: What else? And the other two are 20 what? 21 MR. KENNER: There is one document that 22 Mr. Semprevivo received just reflecting that the 23 insurance company, as a result of this case, is not 24 willing to renew his insurance.

THE COURT: So that's a new document?

25

MR. KENNER: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KENNER: And the other new document,
Your Honor, is a declaration from Attorney Mark Zade,
declaration dated September 24th, 2019. He was local
counsel in the lawsuit where Adam Semprevivo sued
Georgetown. And I've given a copy of that to the
Government, both of those documents.

THE COURT: So with regard to the -- well, let me break these down in two separate pieces. If the notice of non-renewal of insurance the Clerk could add to the docket as an additional filing by the Defendants.

The restitution calculation, I assume the victim would want that filed under seal, as would be appropriate for these things, but that can be added to the docket as a sealed document.

With regard to this further declaration, I think we may want to wait until we get to the discussion about that --

MR. KENNER: Certainly.

THE COURT: -- filing of the lawsuit. This raises questions, I would imagine, that whatever happened there in those negotiations are probably considered by the parties to the negotiation

confidential. I understand the reasons why you would 1 2 want to put this in there in light of the allegations 3 made by the Government, but until we address how to deal with those allegations of the Government, we don't 4 5 know that we want to add this to the docket at this point. 6 7 MR. KENNER: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: So, with that, anything further? 9 No, Your Honor. MS. KEARNEY: 10 MR. KENNER: No, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: And Ms. Kearney, do you have any 12 witnesses or victims present who plan to make any 13 statements? 14 MS. KEARNEY: No, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Thank you. 16 And for defense counsel, have you had an 17 opportunity to review all the materials submitted in 18 connection with the sentencing? 19 MR. KENNER: Yes, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Have you gone over it with the 21 Defendant? 22 MR. KENNER: Yes, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Mr. Semprevivo, have you reviewed 24 all the material?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

25

THE COURT: And have you had a chance to discuss it with your counsel?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And to counsel, also, were you expecting any evidentiary hearing?

MR. KENNER: I do have several people that I would like to address the Court. One is Andrew Chambers. He has submitted a letter. He is a former FBI Agent, co-head of the Anti-Terrorism Task Force in Los Angeles as his last position. He's known Mr. Semprevivo for 15 years and has flown from California to briefly address Your Honor.

The other is Mr. Bob Pratt who is the President and CEO of Volunteers of America Los Angeles with whom Mr. Semprevivo has already been working since I believe May of this year and who has flown here on a red eye to be able to address Your Honor briefly.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

So let's go to the objections to the presentence report. Government Objections 1 through 9 I believe were addressed in my earlier memorandum.

Is there anything further, understanding that you are maintaining that objection?

MS. KEARNEY: Just that we would want it noted for the record.

THE COURT: Thank you.

So I am overruling those objections, as per my memorandum.

Objection 10 is restitution. So the question I have for the Government on restitution is that there is a procedure under 28 USC 3664 which envisions that, during the presentence report process, the Government would notify Probation of the potential victims, and the intention of all of that is that, when I am sitting here making a determination about a sentence, that I have all of this information in front of me. And there is a small window that says that, if a victim's losses are not ascertainable by a date that is ten days prior to sentencing, I can set a date not to exceed 90 days after sentencing.

So here I think what you've given me, as I understood from your sentencing memorandum, is a document that was -- reflects attorneys' fees incurred by Georgetown through August 28. That's a date that was more than ten days before sentencing, so how do you get that in now?

MS. KEARNEY: Your Honor, while the last date of the costs incurred was more than ten days before sentencing, I don't believe that Georgetown necessarily had that information on August 28th.

THE COURT: Why not?

MS. KEARNEY: Because the law firm would have to prepare their bills and --

THE COURT: Okay. So normally a law firm will prepare their bills with the urgency that their client tells them, and certainly the law firm would be the one to know that there is a statutory timeline for submitting these expenses.

MS. KEARNEY: And, Your Honor --

THE COURT: So how do I -- it just -- I understand that it is important to make sure that victims are entitled to their appropriate restitution, but there is a procedure, and it seems that this is just sort of ignoring that.

MS. KEARNEY: Your Honor, I don't have a reason why Georgetown did not get the information to the Government earlier. We were provided the information on September 18th. We promptly provided that information, as I said, to Probation and to defense counsel.

I would note the two cases that we cite in Footnote 3 of our brief do focus on the purpose of the statute being to compensate victims not at the sake of procedure. And, in fact, in the *Dolan* case, 560 US 605, there the Court noted that all the information

necessary to determine restitution was available before the deadline, and the Court still had the authority to order restitution after the deadline.

Likewise, in the *Cheal* case from the First Circuit, 389 F.3d 35, the Government, at a minimum, could provide an estimated restitution amount at the sentencing, and the Court had the authority to hold a hearing later to determine that final restitution amount.

THE COURT: So in the *Parling* case, the Supreme Court acknowledged that, although the primary purpose of restitution is to reimburse the victim, that it has a punitive effect, and it is potentially something to consider under excessive fines.

So the Government is putting me -- or the victim is putting me in the situation where I am entering judgment today that would include an appropriate amount of a fine, and then you're saying to me, In 90 days, we can come forward and tell you the amount of restitution that should be awarded.

And I've previously asked the Government's position on this question in a different case as to whether I could then amend the judgment fine, the answer being no. So you've put me in a position at sentencing of trying to determine what the right

punishment is, and what you're basically saying to me is, Impose a punishment that includes a fine -- that's part of what you've said -- and at the same time we're going to come back, that in order to respect the victims' needs, will have a second punitive effect on the Defendant.

MS. KEARNEY: Your Honor, I believe that one of the issues with the restitution here is that this is one of several Defendants who've been charged who victimized Georgetown --

THE COURT: And, in fact, the Georgetown statement focuses on Defendant Ernst, not Defendant Semprevivo.

MS. KEARNEY: Correct. And one of the issues is that Georgetown is still incurring losses in connection with those other Defendants in terms of participating in the investigation and prosecution.

THE COURT: And as to expenses that are ongoing and later, I think those do fall within the statutory provision for amounts that are not yet ascertainable. So I acknowledge that later expenses may still be raised up through a later date.

MS. KEARNEY: Correct.

THE COURT: My problem is this first \$105,000.

MS. KEARNEY: But the fact that later expenses

can later be raised I think goes to your concern about, Is this now overly punitive? Because even in cases where later expenses are ascertained after the 60 -- or excuse me -- after the 90 days after sentencing, Courts still have the authority to award restitution in those cases, and it's not considered overly punitive.

THE COURT: Well, it might be. I mean, the Supreme Court hasn't directly held this, but they certainly said it may be something to consider as to whether something amounts to an excessive fine.

MS. KEARNEY: And I believe that would be an issue that the Court could analyze at the later hearing. Again, we've asked that this restitution amount not be entirely on Mr. Semprevivo, we've asked for it to be awarded joint and severally with the other Defendants, and in that case, the Court can make the analysis at that further hearing whether Mr. Semprevivo's portion would be overly punitive.

THE COURT: Well, I don't remember -- I don't have the list in front of me of who has some involvement with Georgetown and who doesn't and who has pled guilty and who doesn't, but it's possible -- there are 50-some Defendants here -- it's possible that there may be some persons who might be part of this involved with Georgetown whose resolution at sentencing will be

much later than the 90 days.

MS. KEARNEY: Yes, Your Honor. And that's one of the difficulties we're faced with and why we are asking not to address that issue today but to put it off for a later date so that we will have more information as to who has been convicted by that time.

THE COURT: Yes?

MR. KENNER: Yes. May I be heard, Your Honor?

I was planning to address restitution as part of my letting the Court understand our sentencing position.

The first thing I want to say is I heard

Your Honor make reference to a letter from Georgetown.

I have not received a letter from Georgetown. I

received four pages breaking down the legal expenses of a law firm.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. I listed the letters. I asked if you had reviewed everything. Let's go back.

And maybe I didn't list it as one of the documents that I have received and reviewed.

Victim-impact statement from Georgetown dated August 2nd, 2019. Are you saying you did not receive that?

MR. KENNER: I have four copies of the -- four pages of the expense report.

THE COURT: Can we make a copy of that? I have 1 it here, and let's provide a copy to --2 3 MS. KEARNEY: And Your Honor, I would note it's 4 attached to the presentence report as well. PROBATION OFFICER: Yeah, I believe it was sent 5 as an attachment to the final presentence report. 6 7 MR. KENNER: I'm sorry. It didn't have these 8 numbers at the time. 9 THE COURT: No, no. It doesn't have any 10 numbers. It's a letter. 11 MR. KENNER: Yes. 12 THE COURT: So let's just make sure you have the 13 letter that I'm referring to --MR. KENNER: Yes. Well, that --14 15 THE COURT: -- this August 2nd letter. 16 MR. KENNER: Yes, I have that, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: That's the only letter that I 18 received from Georgetown. But that is the 19 victim-impact statement that was submitted by 20 Georgetown. So now, if you can -- was there any 21 further question on that? 22 MR. KENNER: I just wanted to make reference to 23 an email that I sent to Ms. Kearney after I received 24 these numbers asking for any material that is reflected

by these hours of attorney service that had to do with

25

Mr. Semprevivo and Georgetown. I have to assume, for a \$105,000 of subpoena compliance, that they must have had some information there relative to Mr. Semprevivo.

I note that there was an internal investigation done at Georgetown in 2017, before this case came to be. I don't know if this material includes that investigation. That was an investigation of Mr. Ernst. In 2017, he was relieved of his duties during the investigation. He was terminated on I believe the 6th of June of 2018, and I am led to believe that he got a letter of recommendation from Georgetown to the University of Rhode Island to coach tennis.

My point is, Your Honor, there has to be material that is represented by this that has to do with Mr. Semprevivo. Why I haven't been provided that, I don't know. I certainly think I'm entitled to it, at least to the extent that it pertains to my client.

THE COURT: Okay. So this is what we're going to do on the restitution issue at this point, only as to the objection in the presentence report: I'm overruling the objection. I'm keeping the presentence report the way it is.

That said, the victim has their own rights and ability to ensure that these issues are addressed and, if necessary, addressed on appeal. So if the

Government is asking for a hearing within 90 days, I will set the hearing, and we will address things there.

It is also my intention, unless someone convinces me that this would not be a legal way to proceed, it is my intention to make any fine in this case to be an amount less any amounts of that that are paid for restitution. So in the event that I award -- I impose a fine, I don't intend the fine to be duplicative. I will fine at the maximum amount of the fine I think is appropriate, but I don't intend to do the fine with restitution in excess of that fine or without taking into account that fine.

So I can't -- once I enter the judgment, I can't change the fine, but I do believe I can state on the judgment a fine of X amount, less amounts ordered for restitution.

Is there any objection to my proceeding in that manner?

MS. KEARNEY: No, Your Honor.

MR. KENNER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So I think that resolves all of the objections.

For Probation, was any information withheld from the presentence report pursuant to Rule 32(d)(3)?

PROBATION OFFICER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Okay. So that takes us to the guideline sentencing calculation. The base offense level, I think everyone agrees, is 7. Based on my prior findings regarding the claimed gain and loss, rejecting that argument, there are no increased levels, getting us to an adjusted offense level of 7; a two-level decrease for acceptance of responsibility, total offense level of 5.

And I guess, just to keep the record clear here, the Government objects to that calculation; is that correct?

MS. KEARNEY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And in the Government's view, the total offense level should be --

MS. KEARNEY: In the Government's view, the total offense level should be a 16.

THE COURT: Okay. And I have found and do continue to find the appropriate total offense level here is a level 5.

I think everyone has agreed there are zero criminal history points, which puts Mr. Semprevivo in Criminal History Category I.

So in terms of the sentencing options before the Court, under the statute, I have authority to impose a

sentence of -- a custodial sentence of not more than 20 years. Under the guidelines, as I have calculated them, that is a custodial sentence of zero to six months; under the statute, supervised release of not more than three years, a guideline provision would be one to three years; probation under the statute would be one to five years, guideline is not more than three years; statutory provision is not more than 250,000 or twice the gain/loss, which I have determined here to be zero, so it would be not more than 250,000, the guideline provision is 500 to 9,500; and special assessment of \$100; and restitution, which I am holding thus far was not timely submitted as to past restitution but which may be available for future restitution or ongoing expenses.

Any disagreement with those calculations other than the Government's objection, as previously stated?

MS. KEARNEY: No, Your Honor.

MR. KENNER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So with that, I will hear from the Government.

MS. KEARNEY: Thank you. May I use the podium? THE COURT: Absolutely.

MS. KEARNEY: The Government's sentencing memorandum highlights the contours of Defendant's

conduct. He involved his son in his scheme, including by having him send a completely false email to Gordon Ernst, the Georgetown tennis coach, stating that he played very well with terrific success in doubles this summer and played quite well in singles too and was looking forward to having a chance to play for Ernst at Georgetown.

This Defendant paid the highest bribe amount of any Defendant before the Court in this case, \$150,000 more than the bribe paid by Devin Sloane who was before Your Honor two days ago. He knew that his payment was going to bribe Ernst and was not going as a donation to Georgetown. He carried out his calculated and strategic conduct over the course of eight months, despite numerous opportunities to stop the process between the time he caused his son to send that email to Gordon Ernst in August of 2015 and his payment of that \$400,000 bribe in April of 2016. And, by the way, that email that kicked off the scheme was sent two months before his son's Georgetown application was submitted and five months before the application was actually due.

And after he was arrested, after he pled guilty, he's tried to retain the fruits of his fraud by suing Georgetown to enjoin it from expelling his son,

essentially revictimizing the University.

THE COURT: Okay. So let me now cut in to this question about how I should view litigation. Here are my difficulties with the weight you want to put on that filing: In the record I have in front of me -- and I have not gone to those Courts and those dockets and downloaded those -- but the record I have in front of me, even before the proffered affidavit here, I have a lawsuit is filed and a lawsuit that is withdrawn.

My assumption, without even reading this affidavit, is that there was a private resolution. I don't know what that private resolution is. I don't know the nature of -- well, I don't know the private resolution.

Are there words in that complaint that were filed by these lawyers on behalf of Mr. Semprevivo's son that sure look bad for Mr. Semprevivo? There may well be. Does that suggest good judgment in the choice of words to be used? Maybe not.

But the underlying legal issue does seem a side issue, and without my opening up what happened and what the nature of the resolution and the underlying claim, it does seem that to pin that litigation as a driver of this action is unhelpful and essentially would -- I mean, I do think that, if that is where you go, I then

take this affidavit, if I find there's sort of a conflict between the information I have, you know, do I delve into it? Do I have an evidentiary hearing about what did and didn't happen at Georgetown?

I don't think that's the criminal sentence that's in front of me. So I think this is a point where the Government really can choose your direction here. If the argument you want to make to me is that I should take into account the litigation, then I will allow this affidavit, which I have not yet read carefully, to be filed, and we may need to get into what did or didn't happen at Georgetown.

MS. KEARNEY: Your Honor, the Government does not feel that you need to get into a dispute about what happened in the litigation. The Government also doesn't know the resolution that was reached other than what Defendant has put in his own papers. Even before he put in that affidavit, he acknowledged that the result of the action was that his son was allowed to keep the credits he had earned at Georgetown.

THE COURT: Okay. So I don't have in front of me a meritless suit. I don't have in front of me litigation that was dismissed by the Court; I have in front of me litigation -- I would agree with you that there are choices of words used by the lawyers that are

1

3

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

somewhat inappropriate and perhaps get into the whole idea of Mr. Semprevivo's reliance on experts and that maybe he should have used his own judgment to tone some of those words down.

But regardless, I have a lawsuit that asserted a claim that was resolved to the agreement of those parties. I can't just say that this was a frivolous lawsuit that should somehow be sanctioned. I think the Government's words in your brief were actually quite I think you said it was an abuse of process. strong. "Abuse of process" is a legal term, and you know, Mr. Semprevivo's son, regardless of what his father did, Mr. Semprevivo's son had a right to petition for redress of grievances. That's what your First Amendment right is. You can file a lawsuit. And it wasn't thrown out of Court, it wasn't dismissed. Τo call that an abuse of process seems to me to be pushing the argument away.

But, at any rate, if you do want to go there, I put the affidavit in, we'll get into what the merits of what the resolution were.

MS. KEARNEY: We'll move on.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. KEARNEY: In fact, I want to focus today on what sets this Defendant apart, and that's a level of

egregiousness beyond what has been seen so far in this case.

Two days ago, the Court observed that the suggestion that the focus of this case is on independent school students was about as tone-deaf as you've heard. Well, I think we have a new winner. In his sentencing memorandum, the Defendant refers to himself as the victim throughout his brief. The Defendant's audacity is breathtaking.

He pled guilty to get the benefit of an early plea, and now he claims he is the victim, literally. He writes, at Page 6 of his sentencing memo, "Singer began to create what would eventually become his college racketeering enterprise in which he would gross more than \$25 million from victims like Stephen Semprevivo." And at Page 11, he says that he is analogous to a victim in a Hobbs Act extortion.

This is not the Government summarizing or reading into the Defendant's brief; these are the Defendant's own words. He is not a victim; he is a co-conspirator. The victims are the University and the students who did not get into Georgetown because of the bribe Defendant paid. It's like Defendant does not even remember that he pled guilty to a Federal crime. His own words reveal a lack --

THE COURT: Just to be clear, he did allow this memorandum to be filed on his behalf, but since everything here is being amplified around the country, let's be very clear. I have Mr. Semprevivo's own words, those are his letter to the Court; I have the words that are offered on his behalf by his lawyer. So when you say "in his own words," refer to his letter, and if you want to talk about the memo, the memo filed on his behalf. I will take it that he's responsible for what is filed, but you're going to have the press corps quoting you as saying, This is in his own words. It's not his own words; it's his lawyer's words that he allowed to be filed on his behalf.

MS. KEARNEY: Thank you for that clarification.

The words in his sentencing memo reflect a lack of acceptance of responsibility and a disturbing lack of remorse for his conduct.

A term of imprisonment is necessary for this

Defendant to understand the seriousness of his offense,
to gain respect for the law and to receive just
punishment. Quite simply, this Defendant does not
believe he should be here. Under the words of his
sentencing memo, he thinks he is here because of
someone else's crime against him, that he is a victim
of a Hobbs Act extortion.

2 the
3 Rick
4 succ
5 from
6 what

In trying to convince the Court that he is the victim of his own crime, the Defendant blames Rick Singer for his conduct. He claims that he, a successful businessman with an undergraduate and MBA from Harvard, was afraid of the college counselor and what Singer would do to his son's applications if he pushed back. But Defendant had no problem taking control of his son's applications and submitting those applications to other schools, despite Singer's purported pressure not to do so and Defendant's claimed fear of Singer's reaction.

Most tellingly, though, Defendant had no problem pushing back on Singer in the consensually recorded calls, telling Singer, "Your dealings are your dealings, you did what you did, that was your stuff.

I'm not going to take accountability for your actions."

The calls make clear that Defendant was no passive wall flower or Singer's puppet; he was in control on those calls, trying to push the blame onto Singer and away from himself, just as he is trying to do now. But it gets even --

THE COURT: I agree with you that this Defendant and all of the parents are fully responsible for their own acts, and I agree with you that they aren't the victims. But just to be clear, is the Government not

taking the position that Mr. Singer is the leader of this conspiracy?

MS. KEARNEY: No. The Government is fully aware that Mr. Singer is the leader of this conspiracy, but that doesn't negate the Defendant's conduct.

THE COURT: No, no. But it doesn't -- you're not contending in any of these cases that the parents enticed Mr. Singer into this scheme?

MS. KEARNEY: No. But at the same time, the parents made the decision, and Mr. Semprevivo made the decision, to go forward.

THE COURT: That's noted. I'm not the one who's going to be sentencing Mr. Singer, but I just -- as these various arguments and positions from the parents are being filed, I agree with the Government entirely that the parents need to be held accountable, but I'm a little -- it is a little concerning when the leader of the conspiracy is the cooperator, to take some concern that his role in this isn't minimized. I don't want to say it excuses in any way, but I just -- I hear a little bit of a suggestion that somehow Mr. Singer is not blame-worthy, and it's just, let's be very clear, I'm not sentencing Mr. Singer, his blame isn't here, but he does appear to be the leader of this, not the follower.

MS. KEARNEY: Yes, Your Honor. And I apologize if my words came across as minimizing Mr. Singer. The intent was to show that the Defendant's attempt to minimize his responsibility falls flat.

THE COURT: Understood.

MS. KEARNEY: Perhaps most brazenly in this case, though, the Defendant claims that he has been punished enough already because of the financial losses he purportedly suffered as the victim of his own crime. He claims losses of his attorneys' fees in this case, the \$400,000 bribe he paid, the taxes he owes on that bribe after he fraudulently deducted it from his taxes, and the tuition payments he made to Georgetown.

The notion that this Court should go easy on the Defendant because he lost the value of his \$400,000 bribe or the taxes he now owes on that bribe is not a concept found anywhere in the 3553(a) factors. That Defendant had the audacity to even consider these, quote, unquote, losses to be punishment further demonstrates his lack of acceptance of responsibility and his lack of remorse for his conduct.

In a true reflection of how little remorse he feels, in his sentencing memo, the Defendant does not even mask that he was engaging in this conduct for his own benefit. He was not doing what was best for his

son; but, rather, sought to get what he refers to, or his attorneys refer to at Page 7 of his brief, as the holy grail for successful businessmen and professionals like himself, admission for his child to an elite

university, in other words, bragging rights.

That Defendant still cannot admit that what he did was criminal underscores the need for a sentence above the Court's calculated guidelines in this case, and for these reasons, the Government requests a sentence of 13 months' imprisonment, a \$95,000 fine, 12 months of supervised release and restitution to Georgetown. Such a sentence is sufficient but not greater than necessary to achieve the purposes of 3553(a).

THE COURT: Thank you.

I'll hear from Defendant's counsel.

MR. KENNER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, I'm going to attempt to use my time to address what I believe to be Your Honor's key and core concerns with respect to how to calculate and impose sentence on Mr. Semprevivo.

The Government argues that there has not been an acceptance of responsibility. The Government argues that the sentencing memorandum filed on his behalf disclaims a crime having been committed by

Mr. Semprevivo, and the Government claims that he has not accepted responsibility.

I would like to refer the Court first to Page 2 of the sentencing memorandum where, and I quote from it, "Semprevivo was informed that a 'donation to Singer's 501c3 charity, Key Worldwide Foundation" would be used to benefit the tennis program at Georgetown and garner for his son a preferential admission to the program. Semprevivo knew that the amount requested, coupled with the email and essay holding his son out as a competitive tennis player directed to Coach Ernst, were not logically related to a charitable donation. As Stephen Semprevivo noted in his letter submitted to Probation, that was when he should have notified the authorities."

And on Page 3, it goes on to say, "Semprevivo verily believes that some part of the \$400,000 paid to Key Worldwide was received by Ernst through Singer. It is believed that Singer took part of the money as well." I don't think that that is reflective of a denial of having committed the crime.

On Page 10 of the sentencing memorandum, it reads, "Semprevivo felt that he had been placed in a quandary to make a judgment. For many reasons, as amplified in Dr. Romanoff's report, Semprevivo did not

choose wisely. By failing to stop the process, he went from being a victim to also becoming a co-conspirator. Singer never told him that the tennis coach was being bribed and that the money was being split with Singer. He realized that taking a shortcut outside normal admissions process was wrong and illegal, and his own failure to act was wrong. He was and remains deeply remorseful that he acted against his own character and diminished himself by surrendering his integrity."

Finally, Your Honor, I would quote from Page 11 of the sentencing memorandum where we say, "The crime is certainly serious, and there's no question about that. The nature and circumstances of this offense clearly show that Semprevivo knowingly broke the law, permitting false emails and essays to be transmitted through the mails. Clearly some payments paid to Singer's ostensible 501c3 charity went to compensate the tennis coach to get a preferred admission.

Stephen Semprevivo knows he was wrong and suffers from that daily."

So, Your Honor, while the Government chooses to select some portions of the sentencing memorandum, I would submit to this Court that to glean from the overall sentencing memorandum that Mr. Semprevivo perceives himself to be a victim is disingenuous on the

part of the Government.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your Honor, I also want to, if I might -- I would also like to read from some of the sentencing memorandum -- some of the letters that we submitted together with the sentencing memorandum. They all go to the question of when and that he accepted responsibility.

THE COURT: I am going to let you make your presentation as you see appropriate. I do read all the material that is submitted to me. And I maybe should say to you before I get nine more of these, I don't feel I need an expert report from a criminologist to tell me how to rule here, particularly where it's the same criminologist that's going to be probably presenting for everybody in LA. I'm not sure. But I don't need that. I am reading -- I don't need someone to have quoted all the letters to me. I'm reading the I'm reading the material. This notion of letters. primary sources? I'm going to the primary source. not going to the criminologist's review of the primary source.

You're welcome here to present what you need to present here, I don't want to cut you off, but do rest assured I have read the material in front of me.

MR. KENNER: Your Honor, I know that. I simply

want to read from the letters a sentence or two that refers to acceptance of responsibility. And it's important to note that these letters that I'm making reference to were written long before the -- any sentencings in this case took place.

And I want to start, if I can, with Mr. Semprevivo's letter where he says, "This is not a letter" -- well, you've read his letter. You know what it says. I don't have to quote from it. But it's a clear statement of acceptance of responsibility. Rita Semprevivo, his wife, attests to his acceptance of responsibility.

Andrew Chambers, who I asked if Your Honor would be willing to listen to -- might this be an appropriate time for me to ask him to interrupt me to address the Court?

THE COURT: That would be fine.

MR. KENNER: Thank you.

Go to the podium, please.

MR. CHAMBERS: Your Honor, thank you for this brief opportunity to address the Court.

I was an FBI Agent for 30 years almost, serving from 1985 to 2014. My wife reminded me we've actually known Mr. Semprevivo for 19 years, not 15 years. She's usually right.

So I have only two topics I wish to address.

Stephen -- number one, Stephen Semprevivo is a good husband, a good friend, a good father, until recently a law-abiding member of the community. After this over, I am sure he will be another law-abiding.

After -- second topic: After his arrest, I reached out to Steve, offering to write a letter on his behalf to the Court, if needed, addressing his normal integrity and character. That conversation started with me trying to explain and rationalize what had happened based on my readings. Steve wanted nothing do would that. He totally accepted his guilt. He stated, "This is on me." He's never tried to explain it. He's never made up stories. I do believe he has totally accepted his guilt.

As an FBI Agent working 25 years criminal, mainly 91 matters, bank robberies, I dealt with a lot of criminals, and I rarely saw that acceptance of guilt. Obviously, it was a different avenue, but I do ask that the Court take this in consideration and give the most downward departure possible.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. KENNER: Thank you, sir.

I would refer next to the letter of

Mr. James Burns written on April 28th of 2019 where he says, relative to acceptance, "Knowing Stephen's temperament, values and what a deliberative thinker he is, I was shocked to learn of his involvement in this case. But I was not surprised when Stephen told me straightforwardly and without explanation that he was guilty and that he was going to be accountable for his actions."

That same sentiment is expressed next,

Your Honor, by James Celentano where he writes, "When I

finally spoke with Stephen over this past weekend" -
and this letter is -- I'm sorry -- this letter is dated

April 30th of 2019 -- he says, "He shared how much he

regretted his actions, the pain the situation has

created, especially for his son, and what a profound

learning experience this is for him. Knowing Stephen

all these years, it was not surprising that he is

accepting responsibility, pleading guilty and seeking

to learn and give back to society as much as he can."

Mark and Renee Paul, who I'll speak about later, write in their letter dated May 24th, 2019, they that they introduced Stephen to Mr. Singer after he worked with their child.

The next letter is a letter from Sandy Vella.

Sandy Vella writes on April 26th of 2019, "In order to

grow and help kids grow, Stephen knows he not only needs to accept what he did but must lead the way, ensuring this experience is not forgotten."

On May 27th of 2019, Matthew Coffin writes, "The first time that Stephen and I spoke of this unfortunate situation, he did not give me a story of 'they don't understand' or 'everyone is doing it.' Instead, he stated to me quite clearly that he was ashamed and was not going to fight this, again, taking the humble and responsible person's approach."

Your Honor, I could go through 15 more and read from them. I'm sure Your Honor has read them. They all attest, at a very early stage of these proceedings, Mr. Semprevivo's acceptance of responsibility. We say it in our sentencing memorandum, all of these people say it, and most importantly, as Your Honor said, Mr. Semprevivo says it himself.

The Government makes the point about Mr. Semprevivo having involved his son, and as he has said, that is something for which he has great shame and terrible remorse. But I want Your Honor to understand, just to give context of this case, this is not a case where an African American tennis player was replaced for a white tennis player in its application that Mr. Singer sent to a number of institutions,

including Georgetown. This was not a case where, as you heard the day before yesterday, where a costume was obtained, a hat or a cap with "Italy" on it. This was not a case where Adam Semprevivo cheated on his scores, on his test scores --

THE COURT: Why do you say this isn't a case where another applicant didn't lose out on a position, on a placement?

MR. KENNER: No. I'm saying this is -- I'm trying to put it in a continuum, the levels of involvement.

THE COURT: I understand that, but you just made the assertion that this isn't a case -- and you used race, but putting race aside, this is a case where one student got the position instead of a different -- got the offer letter instead of a different student.

MR. KENNER: There is no question, and we acknowledge that, and I will speak to that momentarily.

THE COURT: I don't have evidence what color skin the person had who didn't get it or what their income was. I do know that the person who got it is -- I don't know, but I'm perhaps guessing here probably didn't have the same resources to pay a \$400,000 bribe for the position or Mr. Singer might have offered it to them. It's a different person who didn't get that

offer, no?

MR. KENNER: Your Honor, we raised this in a footnote on Page 11 of the sentencing memorandum, and I want to be very clear, this is not a victim-less crime. Your Honor is wholly and totally correct about that. Georgetown is not a victim of Stephen Semprevivo, in my view; they're a victim of Gordon Ernst.

The children that did not get an opportunity to get the spot that Mr. Semprevivo's son got, they are the victims of Mr. Semprevivo, and we accept that and want to be very clear about it.

THE COURT: Just so we're clear about

Georgetown's standing here in this case, I have agreed with the Probation Officer that they did not articulate specific monetary losses sufficient to be measured for purposes of gain and loss. I have not found that they aren't a victim of this conspiracy, and the conspiracy is the crime in front of me. And so to say, Well, it was Mr. Ernst's part of the conspiracy rather than Mr. Singer's part of the conspiracy, rather than Mr. Semprevivo's part of the conspiracy, I can't parse it that way. I think that, as long as you agree that Georgetown is a victim of the conspiracy, then it's a victim.

MR. KENNER: I do believe that they're a victim

of the conspiracy. I also agree that Mr. Ernst was paid \$2.5 million, going back to 2012, by Mr. Singer. I also agree that there was an investigation by Georgetown in 2017, an independent internal investigation of Gordon Ernst. The results of that independent investigation were that Mr. Ernst was placed on leave and then terminated and fired from the University. I don't know what that report actually said. I've been asking for it. I have never received it.

THE COURT: Well, and in the event that I don't order restitution and Georgetown proceeds on a civil claim for a claim based on a loss of honest services of Mr. Ernst, all of that might come out in discovery.

But that's not where we are here. We're in this criminal proceeding here.

MR. KENNER: I understand that, Your Honor, and I want to also acknowledge that the essence of the crime here is the corruption of the college admissions program or the methodology by which it takes place that Mr. Singer facilitated, Mr. Semprevivo paid him, he knew that money was being paid as a bribe to Gordon Ernst, and it's not a victim-less crime, Your Honor.

I wholeheartedly agree, and I want to underscore

that on behalf of Mr. Semprevivo who says that essentially in his own memorandum, and other people have said it as well, that there are people who didn't get a spot that Mr. Semprevivo's son got because of the bribe that was paid from Stephen Semprevivo to Singer to Ernst, and that's clear. And we own that, and I believe we have no -- Mr. Semprevivo wants to own it, and he's owned it since the time he entered the plea in this case.

I want to move to the 3553 factors. Your Honor, again, in seeking a punishment sufficient but not greater than necessary in this case -- and I know you want to address each Defendant individually and with respect to their situation -- I can say, and I know Your Honor has read all of it, that Mr. Semprevivo, unlike Government's depiction, has accepted responsibility and has expressed great remorse, which he will live with for the rest of his life.

This is not a situation where he is trying to walk away from this. He acknowledges that the crime was committed; he acknowledges that he hurt the child that didn't get in; he acknowledges that he hurt the integrity of the entire admissions process, as it's meant to be; and he understands that he was a participant in the corruption of the admissions scheme,

and I don't say that derogatorily, but the way in which colleges approach admitting students.

And for all of that, he is very sorry. And unless Your Honor has any other questions, I would submit on that.

THE COURT: You had mentioned before you had one other person who --

MR. KENNER: Oh, yes. I'm so sorry. Mr. Pratt.

MR. PRATT: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. PRATT: I'm proposing that Mr. Semprevivo begin immediately work as a full-time volunteer for Volunteers of America of Los Angeles in behalf of a number of our youthful clients. The first group is runaway homeless youth, including great numbers of LGBTQ and victims of sex-trafficking and young newly discharged veterans who have become homeless and are exhibiting symptoms of PTSD.

This focus will be on job training in the construction trades for these young people. And this project only came about because of six months of work beginning in the beginning of April on the part of Mr. Semprevivo, creating a social enterprise for Volunteers of America, which would be a business, placing two- and three-bedroom units in the back yards

of single-family residences in Los Angeles, producing income to underwrite the training for this population of youth.

I see Mr. Semprevivo as a key part of that training. It's a combination of classroom and on-the-job training with the installation of these units, and a lot of key issues need to be worked with with these youngsters, including world-of-work issues, what it takes to get and hold a job; financial literacy; and, even more particularly, the one commonality of these youngsters, sadly, is what we call deficiency stories. They have been told in so many different ways that they'll never amount to anything, and that's a real story for them, but it's not a true story. I've seen Mr. Semprevivo as an entirely compassionate and engaged person, internally motivated to do something about social problems.

The other group that he will work with are Upward Bound students. Upward Bound is a program that volunteers operates throughout the City of Los Angeles providing pre-college support for youngsters who will be the first in their family to attend college. The Upward Bound regimen is extensive. All day Saturday the students come together for workshops, for financial counseling and for other things that are going to be

necessary for them to not only succeed in enrolling in college but completing their degrees.

The other facets of the program provide after-school tutoring for the youngsters, sometimes at our program site, sometimes in the high schools themselves, and there's also a provision for after hours that is convenient for the students when they're doing their homework for Skype interaction, and I would propose that Mr. Semprevivo be part of all of that. A lot of these students have a great interest in business, but they're intimidated. I can't think of a better role model for business than Mr. Semprevivo.

And an interesting side light that I've experienced with him -- he's got a wonderful, easy-going, accepting, patient disposition -- is he's badgered me continuously for all the information I can gather for him about the homeless issue in Los Angeles and about what the solutions would be.

So I would offer the Court this opportunity as an alternative in behalf of Los Angeles's most needy youngsters.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. KENNER: Your Honor, might I just add the programs specifically are set forth in the Attachment 2

that I provided you a more legible copy of and has -Mr. Semprevivo has made a commitment to every Saturday
and two afternoons or evenings a week to work with
these children, and he has been working with Mr. Pratt
to get that together and to make it -- they currently
serve 500 students. Mr. Semprevivo's goal -- 500
students a year. Mr. Semprevivo's goal is to increase
that to 1,000 students a year.

Having said all of that, I am not unmindful of Your Honor's previous comments with respect to the need to have some imprisonment for the people that were involved in this. I am mindful and respectful of that. And toward that end, I would suggest and recommend to the Court a sentence of 90 days, a split sentence, 45 days in custody and whatever -- for the other 45 and more, if Your Honor sees fit, in-house arrest so that he can quickly get back to assisting Mr. Pratt in these great things and still serve some time.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Semprevivo, do you want to address the Court?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

Thank you, Your Honor. I deserve to be punished for the illegal actions that I took. I believe that you will sentence me to some time in prison, and I want

you to know that I accept any sentence that you deem fit. I am fully responsible and take full responsibility for my actions and feel I should be punished.

I apologize to the Court, Your Honor, the US Government for all of the resources and time it's taken to bring my case forward. I apologize to all the college-bound students and their parents and the terrible example I've set for them and the fact that I've led them to lose faith in the college admissions process. I'm so sorry for that.

I apologize to all of the young people who I've mentored throughout my career who I've taught to be honest and trust-worthy both in the office and outside the office first. I've let you all down, and I'm sorry for that.

And I apologize to my wife Rita who has forgiven me, but I don't deserve that. She's been the rock for us. She's been supportive to our entire family throughout this. She doesn't deserve this.

I apologize to my son Adam who my activities have hurt him so much. He's been a great son who has never let me down, and I apologize, Adam. I've let you down so much here. You didn't deserve this.

I apologize to my son Jordan who, because of all

that's been going on, this has impacted his health.

I'm sorry, Jordan, that had to happen.

I want to apologize to my sister and my brother who have been very supportive to me throughout this.

I'm sorry for bringing shame on our family.

I want to apologize to the rest of my family and my friends who have been supportive. I've let you all down.

Again, Your Honor, I take full responsibility for my actions. This is the first and only crime and certainly the last crime I will ever commit. Moving forward, I'm going to make good and be true to all those people that I've let down.

I -- you know, after any time in incarceration, I look to give back to my community, specifically, if Your Honor deems fit, to work with Volunteers of America in helping youth and homeless.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

So I am required to consider the factors at 18 USC, Section 3553(a), and I have considered those factors. I need to consider the nature and circumstance of the offense, the Defendant's personal criminal history and characteristics, purposes of sentencing, the kinds of sentences available, the kinds

of sentence and sentencing range established for the category of offense committed by the category of Defendant under the guidelines, the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct and the need to provide restitution to victims.

With regard to the purposes of sentencing, I must consider those factors that I just listed and impose a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with these purposes; that is, that they will reflect the seriousness of the offense and promote respect for the law, provide just punishment for the offense, afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, protect the public from further crimes of this Defendant and provide the Defendant with corrective treatment in the most effective manner.

I'm going to start here with the nature of the offense. The Government has described two different fraudulent schemes as part of this conspiracy: The test-taking scheme, which was a set of actions, including bribes and changing test answers; and the recruitment scheme, which includes bribes and fraudulent profiles. Both of these types of conduct --both of these schemes involved illegal fraudulent

conduct, in violation of the same statute. The purpose of the two schemes was somewhat different, though. The purpose of the test-taking scheme was to change one aspect of a student's application to make that application more competitive. The purpose of the recruitment scheme was to gain a specific spot at a university.

Here, this Defendant was not involved in any way in the test-taking scheme. He was, however, involved in the recruitment scheme. And as I consider the culpability of those two different schemes, I do view -- they're both fraud, they're both illegal, they both violate the same statute, but there is something that's an order of magnitude different about actually buying a specific spot at a university versus fraudulently changing part of an application.

And so while I -- and I disagreed with the Government about using the dollar differences that the different parents paid as a proxy for the gain or loss. I do think the ballpark prices for the two different types of schemes, 15,000 to 75,000 for changing test answers versus 250,000 to 400,000 for buying spots, showed that Mr. Singer and the parents involved also have an understanding of the different orders of magnitude of the two schemes. So the nature of the

crime in front of me was purchasing that spot or trying to purchase that spot, conspiring to purchase that spot at a particular university.

The difference between the 250,000 and 400,000 doesn't give me any light, though, on culpability. The fact that one coach charged more to get a spot for a student at one university versus the price that was charged at a different university doesn't make one crime more or greater or less in my mind. So with regard to the specific offense, I don't see a difference between the parent who paid 250,000 and the parent who paid 400,000 just because the coaches seemed to be charging different prices.

This particular crime did involve -- the

Defendant did involve his son, and I think that is a

factor that does make the nature of the crime more
serious, as I think the Defendant understands. And I

do find that the nature of this crime does drive an
incarcerative sentence, although I find, unlike the

Government, that that should fall within the guideline
range of the zero to six months.

And part of that and part of the nature of the circumstances here is, again, the nature of general deterrence. And this is a case that I do -- I don't usually agree with the Government on this, but I do

think on this one, this is a -- in this case, that these sentences may have a generally deterrent effect.

I turn to the Defendant's personal history and characteristics. And as with all of these, with the Defendants I have sentenced so far, and I would not be surprised to find the case the same with the Defendants still to come in front of me, the people have generally been law-abiding and respected members and decent members of their community.

It doesn't excuse the crime. It is taken into account to some measure by the fact that there's zero criminal history here and by the fact that I will not be imposing a sentence to protect the society further from this Defendant. I do view that as helpful in trying to determine any likelihood of recidivism.

I did -- and I have a hard time sometimes distinguishing between overzealous advocacy and where a Defendant actually views things. I don't think that the harm suffered by this Defendant can be seen as greater than the harm that's suffered by a person who commits a felony who is poor. The dollar value, they may have lost a job that only was paying \$10 an hour versus losing a job that was paying much, much more, but certainly the economic effect is going to be far greater on the person who doesn't have the resources

both in terms of your background and experience and capabilities and connections. You don't have to go, when you get out of this, and apply for a job where you have to check a box and will never be considered once you check that box.

So somewhere in the papers there was a suggestion of a fear of losing a home or that you won't be able to rebuild your professional life. I don't find those arguments persuasive, but I also am not sure that those are ones that I am pinning on you rather than perhaps the excessive advocacy here. I do -- I give you no extra points for the harm suffered, but I am not detracting from -- by the presentation here.

I keep coming back to the excuse for what happened here that people are using, and I'd like to quote one of the letters that one of the parents wrote because I think this is something to reflect on. The parent wrote, "As anybody who has had a high schooler navigating the chaotic, arbitrary and, frankly, terrifying college admissions process knows, the importance of relying on academic tutors and consultants with expertise to help our kids is crucial."

That terrifying college admission process, think about how terrifying that college admission process is

for the applicant whose parents didn't even go to college. Think how terrifying that process is for the students and parents who don't have the resources to hire tutors and consultants with expertise no matter how crucial that might be.

And think about the inner city or rural students who might not have any resources but nonetheless make their way into a college but with scores more like your kids had before you started tutoring rather than afterward, and they get into these colleges, and their legitimacy is challenged every day that somehow they were the ones who got a break to get there, rather than the child who arrived there with all of these resources.

I don't criticize you for being taken in by a person with masterful skills of deception. That's how crimes happen all the time is some people get other people to commit crimes, and that's where we end up with a crime and a conspiracy. And I also -- I do understand, from what I'm hearing in these papers, that Mr. Singer was open to parents in rooms, in lecture halls, parents with lots of money to whom he pitched the side door, and I think the question that all of these parents need to ask is not, Well, of course we all hired an expert; I think the question that people

need to ask is: What makes your children entitled to a side door?

I am -- as I said earlier, I am not considering the lawsuit against Georgetown in part of the sentencing. I don't have sufficient information to make any determination that that was an abuse of legal process that overstated the circumstance.

I do find that you are remorseful and have taken acceptance of responsibility for this. And in making a determination that incarceration is needed, I don't believe it is needed further for personal rehabilitation or protecting you from -- protecting the community from you, but I do find that incarceration is appropriate, despite no prior record.

I intend to impose a sentence of four months of incarceration; I intend to impose two years of supervised release; community service as part of the rehabilitation, and I will order 500 hours of community service. I don't have any reason to think that this --your proposed placement is inappropriate, but I will leave that in -- the first review of that by the Probation Office.

I am focusing on community service, as it seems like your proposal includes, in making sure that you're not simply using your managerial talents to continue

doing managerial work, you're welcome to do that in addition to the 500 hours but that the 500 hours are really directed at the time spent directly with students or families.

On the fines, I agree with the Government that a guideline fine in this case would not be a sufficient punitive fine.

Sentencing Guidelines Section 5E1.2(d) states that the amount of the fine should be sufficient to ensure that the fine, taken together with other sanctions, is punitive, and so I intend to impose a fine of \$100,000, which is well in excess of a guideline fine but is just 40 percent of the amount that you paid as a bribe in this case. But I will include on the judgment that, if restitution is ultimately awarded, that would be -- the fine is 100,000 less the restitution that would be awarded.

So that is the sentence that I intend to impose. It is a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to accomplish the goals of sentencing.

Any objection before I formally impose -- oh, I'm sorry. All of the same -- all of the supervision conditions that are listed in the presentence report at Pages 36 to 38, a special assessment of \$100 and no restitution based on the amounts incurred prior to

August 31, but I will set a sentencing date -- a date for hearing for restitution within 90 days for any further costs that had not been determinable at that time.

So with that, any objections before I formally impose sentence?

MS. KEARNEY: No, Your Honor.

MR. KENNER: No objections, Your Honor. But I would ask that the Court make a judicial recommendation to the lowest security camp at the Taft facility of the Bureau of Prisons, and I would ask that he be allowed to self-surrender to that facility.

THE COURT: I'm happy to order a self-surrender, and I'm happy to order a judicial recommendation to a facility commensurate with his security level at a particular location. I am advised by the Bureau of Prisons that they don't appreciate a particular facility name. So tell me what the location is where you would like the --

MR. KENNER: The location would be in the Central District of California.

THE COURT: We'll make that recommendation.

MR. KENNER: And is Your Honor recommending a camp or lower security?

THE COURT: I will recommend the lowest security

1 2

3 4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

commensurate with his security level. The presentence report shows no reason for there to be anything other than the lowest security level. But, again, the Bureau of Prisons makes the determination from those facts.

> MR. KENNER: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So Mr. Semprevivo, will you please stand.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, and having considered the sentencing factors enumerated at 18 USC, Section 3553(a), it is the judgment of the Court that the Defendant, Stephen Semprevivo, is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of four months.

I will make a judicial recommendation that you be incarcerated at a facility commensurate with your security level in the Central District of California, and you will be permitted to self-surrender. What date would that be?

PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, generally it's four to six weeks for designation purposes.

THE COURT: So November -- is that Tuesday, November 7th?

PROBATION OFFICER: I believe six weeks would be Thursday, November 7th.

THE COURT: Thursday, November 7th, for

self-reporting.

Upon release from imprisonment, you shall be placed on supervised release for a term of two years. And within 72 hours of release, you shall report in person to the district to which you are released.

I am ordering that you shall pay the United States a fine of \$100,000, less any amount of restitution that is imposed, and that amount will be due after any determination and resolution of any -- I guess it's not technically an appeal if the victim disagrees with my findings, but it's a writ, but any resolution of those proceedings, 14 days after that.

While on supervision, you have to comply with the mandatory conditions of supervision. You must not commit another Federal, state or local crime. You must not unlawfully possess a controlled substance.

Drug-testing conditions are suspended based on my determination that you pose a low risk of substance abuse. You must cooperate in the collection of DNA, as requested by the Probation Office.

The additional mandatory conditions: You must make restitution, if any is ordered, and pay the \$100 assessment, which I guess I didn't say, but there's a \$100 special assessment, and you must pay that, as imposed. You must also pay the fine in accordance with

the schedule I will set forth on the judgment. And you must notify the Court of any material change in your economic circumstances that might affect your ability to pay so long as any amounts are outstanding.

You shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by the Court, which are described at Sentencing Guidelines Section 5D1.3(c).

And then, during the period of supervised release, you must -- within six months from release of custody, you must cooperate with the Examination and Collection Division of the IRS. You must provide to the Examination Division all financial information necessary to determine your prior tax liabilities. You must provide to the Collection Division all financial information necessary to determine your ability to pay. You must file accurate and complete tax returns for those years for which returns were not filed or for which inaccurate returns were filed, and you must make a good-faith effort to pay all delinquent and additional taxes, interest and penalties.

You're prohibited from incurring new credit charges or opening additional lines of credit without the approval of the Probation Office while any financial obligations remain outstanding. You must provide the Probation Office access to any requested

financial information, which may be shared with the Financial Litigation Unit of the US Attorney while any financial obligations remain outstanding.

You must complete 500 hours of community service at an agency approved by the Probation Office; and, again, that would be an agency providing direct services to students or their families. And the special assessment of \$100.

With that, the sentence is imposed for all the reasons previously stated and because the Court believes the sentence, in all its components, is reasonable and is a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to accomplish the goals of sentencing, consistent with 18 USC, Section 3553, and the Supreme Court's guidance.

Your plea agreement with the Government limits your rights of appeal. Under the terms of the plea agreement, you have waived your right to challenge your conviction on direct appeal or in a future proceeding, and you have waived your right to challenge your sentence on direct appeal or in a future proceeding. However, you may still appeal on the grounds of ineffective assistance or that the prosecutor engaged in misconduct.

So, with that, the sentence is imposed, as

stated.

There's no objection to -- you may be seated.

There's no objection to the Defendant remaining released and self-reporting; correct?

MS. KEARNEY: Correct.

THE COURT: I find by clear and convincing evidence that the Defendant is not likely to flee or pose a danger to the safety of any other person or the community if released, and he is released to self-report, as stated.

Failure to surrender for service of sentence pursuant to this judgment will result in a punishment of a fine or imprisonment for not more than ten years or -- and that any term of imprisonment shall be consecutive to the sentence imposed here. If you're convicted of an offense committed while on release, you should be sentenced in addition to a term of imprisonment of not more than ten years if the offense is a felony or not more than one year if it is a misdemeanor.

So, with that, you are directed to self-report to the designated Bureau of Prisons facility in six weeks.

Is there anything further?

MS. KEARNEY: No, Your Honor.

MR. KENNER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And perhaps after you talk with Georgetown, you can let my Clerk know if we need to set a date for a further restitution hearing.

MS. KEARNEY: We'll do that. Thank you.

PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, and I just want to clarify for the record, I believe if you do issue a restitution order and issue an amended judgment with a restitution order, that you will then have to formally amend the fine amount in accordance with that restitution order. I think that that's the clearest way for the Accounting Department of our Clerk's Office to understand what moneys are going toward the fine and what moneys are going to the restitution without having to do the math themselves, so to speak. So I think, if you are going to amend it and include restitution, you also amend it and reduce the fine in accordance with the contingency that you have outlined.

THE COURT: Thank you. I think the point is well-taken, that it does need to be clear. The reason I'm wording it this way and not merely amending the fine is under the understanding that, once I've imposed a firm fine, I don't get to look back and change it, and so I am making clear right now at the time of judgment that the restitution would offset the fine.

MR. KENNER: Your Honor, may I just impose upon the Court to make a request that we be provided with discovery from the materials that were provided to the Government from Georgetown, as they relate to Mr. Semprevivo, for purposes of the restitution hearing, if there is one?

THE COURT: So at this juncture, I've denied Georgetown's request for restitution up through the August 31 billing. They're welcome to file a motion for seeking restitution for amounts incurred after August 31, and you can make your request in connection with that.

If they seek reconsideration of my order denying restitution, which I denied on a purely procedural issue, that they didn't file it ten days ahead, if they seek reconsideration of that and I allow it, you're welcome at that time to make your request for discovery. But it's premature.

MR. KENNER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE CLERK: Court is in recess. All rise.

(Adjourned 12:40 p.m.)

 $\underline{\mathsf{C}}\ \underline{\mathsf{F}}\ \underline{\mathsf{R}}\ \underline{\mathsf{T}}\ \underline{\mathsf{I}}\ \underline{\mathsf{F}}\ \underline{\mathsf{I}}\ \underline{\mathsf{C}}\ \underline{\mathsf{A}}\ \underline{\mathsf{T}}\ \underline{\mathsf{I}}\ \underline{\mathsf{0}}\ \underline{\mathsf{N}}$ I, Debra D. Lajoie, RPR-FCRR-CRI-RMR, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes in the above-entitled case. /s/ Debra D. Lajoie 9/29/19